1	A No, it is not.
2	Q And, in fact, as the Judge said,
3	you can go down the street here and probably
4	buy a CIA hat or an FBI hat and probably buy
5	an Osama bin Laden hat for all I know.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Strike that. But
7	the other two I know for a fact.
8	BY MR. LYON:
9	Q Do you think people who buy those
10	hats are trying to impersonate federal agents?
11	A I do not.
12	Q Mr. Titus wasn't wearing that hat
13	when he was in the bathroom, was he
14	A No.
15	Q to your knowledge?
16	A To my knowledge, he was not.
17	Q To your knowledge, he's never worn
18	that hat?
19	A I have no idea whether he's worn
20	it or not.
21	Q Okay. Now, in your e-mail to Ms.
22	Keller, you also said that this clown was

1	caught with a KEL-Light?
2	A Well, I didn't use that term but
3	more than one time.
4	Q That term being clown or KEL-
5	Light?
6	A Clown.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did that come in
8	evidence, by the way, that you're referring to
9	
10	MR. LYON: No, it's not, your
11	Honor. I can put it in evidence as soon as I
12	find it.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
14	that's all right. Keep going. I don't want
15	to stop you now, but I do want to put that in
16	evidence.
17	MR. LYON: All right.
18	BY MR. LYON:
19	Q Just to be accurate, the light
20	actually wasn't a KEL-Light, it was a Mag-
21	light, wasn't it? I'm sorry. Strike that.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: I can tell you

1	exactly what it was.
2	BY MR. LYON:
3	Q Officer Franklin called it a
4	Maglite, right?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: It was a Stream
6	Light X20.
7	MR. LYON: But I think Officer
8	Franklin might have called it a Maglite.
9	BY MR. LYON:
10	Q The fact is that Mr. Titus was not
11	caught with the flashlight in the bathroom,
12	was he?
13	A Not that I know of, no.
14	Q And, in fact, he wasn't caught
15	with it at all. It was in his vehicle.
16	A That's correct, as far as I know.
17	Q Do you think it is a good idea for
18	a motorist to have a flashlight in his or her
19	vehicle?
20	A I think it makes perfectly good
21	sense.
22	Q Do you have a problem that Mr.

1	Titus had a Stream Light? Is that something
2	that concerns you? Or that type of light,
3	whatever it is. Do you know what a Stream
4	Light is?
5	A I do. I own one. It's my police
6	flashlight.
7	Q Okay. And do you have a problem
8	that Mr. Titus had a Stream Light?
9	A Once again, anybody can go into a
10	uniform store and buy a Stream Light, as well
11	as buying a police hat, as well as, you know,
12	buying a number of things. However, in
13	considering the totality of the circumstances
14	and when you have a person whose crimes are of
15	power and control and they are buying symbols
16	of power and control, you are concerned. And
17	my experience has shown me that those type of
18	things should be a concern.
19	Q Do you think anybody ever told Mr.
20	Titus in his sex offender treatment that you
21	shouldn't have a Stream Light because someone

might mistake you as a police officer?

1	A I don't know whether they told him
2	that or not.
3	Q Do you think they did?
4	A Well, I have no idea.
5	Q Okay. Isn't the principal
6	difference between a Stream Light or a KEL-
7	Light or a Maglite and your typical hardware
8	store light that the Stream Light type light
9	is more durable?
10	A They're usually made out of
11	aluminum or steel, and they tend to be far
12	brighter than your typical flashlight you
13	would buy in a hardware store.
14	Q And a typical flashlight that you
15	would buy in a hardware store has a reputation
16	for breaking if you drop it, doesn't it?
17	A I don't know if that's the
18	reputation of those kind of flashlights or
19	not.
20	Q They're certainly less durable
21	than a Maglite or a Stream Light or a KEL-
22	Light?

1	A I don't know that I would be able
2	to say that. I can tell you that the police
3	flashlights are pretty durable because they
4	get a lot of hard use. As far as hardware
5	store flashlights, I don't know. I've got
6	flashlights that I got at hardware stores that
7	are working for years afterwards. So I don't
8	know, you know, what the reputation would be
9	of a hardware store flashlight.
10	Q Okay. It's certainly not against
11	the law to carry a Maglite or a Stream Light
12	or a KEL-Light?
13	A No, I said that previously.
14	Q And can you identify this
15	flashlight?
16	A Surefire 6P.
17	Q Okay. Are you familiar with that
18	flashlight?
19	A I'm not.
20	Q Okay. In your experience, do some
21	officers carry a light similar to this?
22	A I've seen lights similar to that,

1	yes.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you describe
3	it in terms of size for the record?
4	MR. LYON: Sure. The record will
5	reflect that this is a Surefire 6P flashlight.
6	It is quite bright, and it's quite durable.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: How long is it?
8	MR. LYON: It's about four inches
9	long, I guess.
10	MS. LANCASTER: And how wide is
11	it?
12	MR. LYON: It's about one-inch
13	wide.
14	BY MR. LYON:
15	Q Detective Shilling, I own several
16	of these, and does that make you think that
17	I'm looking for power and control by owning
18	this?
19	A No.
20	Q Even though some officers use
21	lights such as this?
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, this line of

1	questioning is totally irrelevant. He said,
2	his premise was that the crimes, whether you
3	want to call them adjudications or whatever,
4	that Mr. Titus has been convicted of have to
5	do, are related to power and control, and
6	that's his assumption. And then this is
7	paraphernalia he feels are an expression of
8	that power and control. So that's stay to
9	that.
10	MR. LYON: Okay. I'll move on,
11	your Honor.
12	BY MR. LYON:
13	Q The fact is that Mr. Titus didn't
14	have his flashlight in the bathroom with him,
15	right?
16	A I have no information that he had
17	his flashlight in the bathroom with him.
18	Q And, in fact, the information you
19	had was that it was found in his vehicle,
20	right?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Now, Mr. Titus did have a necklace

1	on him. Have you seen the necklace in
2	question?
3	A I haven't seen the necklace in
4	question. I have seen those necklaces,
5	though, and the badges.
6	Q Okay. And the medallion on the
7	necklace is about the size of a nickel, isn't
8	it?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Now, Mr. Titus was not arrested in
11	connection with the events of Mercer Island?
12	A No, he was not.
13	Q He wasn't charged with anything?
14	A No.
15	Q And there were no minors even
16	present at Mercer Island, right?
17	A No, there were not.
18	Q And, in fact, it was three in the
19	morning, correct?
20	A Yes, it was.
21	Q And you wouldn't expect to find
22	minors present in a park at three in the

1	morning, would you?
2	A No, you would not.
3	Q After being advised of the Mercer
4	Island matter, you re-evaluated Mr. Titus sex
5	offender level, correct?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Okay. And do you recall receiving
8	a subpoena from me?
9	A I do.
10	Q And that asked for all your
11	evaluations of Mr. Titus?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Okay. In response to that, you
14	gave me an evaluation dated 2/26/08, and I'm
15	showing the witness a document which is called
16	Washington State Sex Offender Risk Level
17	Classification revised 1990. It is a four-
18	page document.
19	A Yes.
20	Q And is that the evaluation that
21	you gave me?
22	A It is.

1	Q Did you give me any other
2	evaluations?
3	A No.
4	Q Why not?
5	A Because there hadn't been any
6	done.
7	Q But I thought you re-evaluated Mr.
8	Titus after Mercer Island.
9	A I did.
10	Q You didn't do it on paper?
11	A No.
12	Q You did it in your head?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Now, page excuse me for one
15	second. At page six of your prepared
16	testimony
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's Exhibit 2?
18	MR. LYON: I'm sorry, yes.
19	BY MR. LYON:
20	Q EB Exhibit 2, page six, line 21
21	through 23, you say, do you not, "After the
22	End of Sentence Review Committee assesses a

1	sex offenders risk of re-offense, a local law
2	enforcement agency may change the sex
3	offender's ranking only after justifying such
4	modification in writing." Did you justify Mr.
5	Titus' change in level in writing?
6	A I did not.
7	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I ask, your
8	Honor, that he be given an opportunity to
9	explain his answer.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait, wait, wait,
11	wait. That's not the way cross examination
12	works. Go ahead.
13	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The question
14	was misleading, though, your Honor.
15	Objection, misleading. There's no foundation
16	that the End of Sentence Review Committee had,
17	at any point, evaluated Mr. Titus.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: That wasn't his
19	question.
20	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The premise
21	of the question was after the End of Sentence
22	Review Committee evaluates somebody, you can

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

only depart in writing. The End of Sentence 1 2 Review Committee has never evaluated Mr. Titus, as my understanding of his testimony. 3 And if I'm wrong, Detective Shilling could 4 5 explain it. 6 MR. LYON: Well, your Honor, 7 guess if that's the case, I have no idea why this sentence has been included in the report 8 or in this witness' testimony because it 9 certainly implied to me, and I must confess 10 that before this hearing I was under the 11 12 impression that the End of Sentence Review 13 Committee had addressed Mr. Titus' sex 14 offender level. But in any event --15 JUDGE SIPPEL: What is the 16 sentence again? Where are you --17 MR. LYON: It says, "After the End of Sentence Review Committee assesses a sex 18 offender's risk of re-offense, a local law enforcement agency may change the sex offender's ranking only after justifying such

modification in writing." All I asked was did

19

20

21

1	the witness justify in writing his change of
2	Mr. Titus from a level two or a level three.
3	I guess I will stipulate, if counsel wishes,
4	that the End of Sentence Review Committee
5	apparently didn't do it, did not ever assess
6	him. But I'd like to go ahead and move on to
7	my next question.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
9	BY MR. LYON:
10	Q Doesn't this statement of yours
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm overruling the
12	objection by the way. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
13	BY MR. LYON:
14	Q Doesn't this statement of yours on
15	page six indicate, at the very least, a
16	standard procedure that re-evaluation of a sex
17	offender should be supported by written
18	documentation?
19	A Well, first of all, Mr. Titus, his
20	case had never been before the End of Sentence
21	Review Committee. Having sat on the End of
22	Sentence Review Committee, I know all of the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	things that make up the risk assessment, and
2	there was no question in my mind that Mr.
3	Titus would, in fact, have been a level three
4	under the WASOST. And as it turns out, I was
5	right.
6	Q So you didn't think it was
7	important to justify your re-evaluation in
8	writing? Yes? No?
9	A I probably should have put it in
10	writing just for completeness of the record.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me just
12	ask this question this way then: was your
13	failure to put it in writing inconsistent with
14	the regulatory procedures for assessing for
15	ranking sex offenders? I'm talking about
16	procedures.
17	THE WITNESS: If, in fact, Mr.
18	Titus had been reviewed by the End of Sentence
19	Review Committee, then I am required by law to
20	complete a notice notifying the End of
21	Sentence Review Committee that Mr. Titus has
22	been aggravated to a higher level or even

1	mitigated to a lower level. The fact that Mr
2	Titus was not seen by the End of Sentence
3	Review Committee, there is no requirement that
4	anything be in writing regarding his risk
5	level.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: So under the
7	procedures of the Washington Police Department
8	that you're operating under at that time,
9	assuming that you had what, you know, you felt
10	was just cause, but you could on your own
11	reassess him up or down without putting it in
12	writing?
13	THE WITNESS: That's correct, your
14	Honor.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
16	BY THE WITNESS:
17	Q Now, just a few more questions
18	regarding Mercer Island. At page 41 of
19	Enforcement Bureau Exhibit 4, there's a
20	reference to the fact that one of the officers
21	found a bottle of lotion in the bathroom,
1	

correct?

1	A Yes.
2	Q Okay. There's nothing in the
3	report to tie Mr. Titus to that lotion,
4	correct?
5	A I don't recall there was.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where is this
7	statement that you're referring to in this
8	report?
9	THE WITNESS: It's in the very
10	last paragraph, your Honor.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm looking
12	at something that says lotion here.
13	THE WITNESS: It's the third line
14	in the last page.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I have it, I have
16	it, yes. He was found by Mercer Island Police
17	in a darkened park bathroom with a bottle of
18	lotion at 3 a.m.
19	BY MR. LYON:
20	Q Now, the fact is that the officer
21	reported that that lotion was found in the
22	corner of the bathroom, correct?

1	A 1'm not sure. The discussion that
2	I had with the officer was exactly as it's
3	written here.
4	Q If you could turn to page 39 of
5	Enforcement Bureau Exhibit 4, in the first
6	paragraph about midway down, and,
7	unfortunately, I'm not as organized as Ms.
8	Lancaster and I haven't numbered this, but it
9	looks like two, four, six
10	A I see.
11	Q eight lines, lines eight and
12	nine, Officer Franklin says that, "I observed
13	no damage to the interior of the restroom,
14	just a plastic container of Neutrogena lotion
15	in the corner of the restroom." But you're
16	saying that when you spoke to the officer, you
17	were told that Mr. Titus was caught with it?
18	A He said that Mr. Titus had it.
19	Q Okay. So, in fact, what the
20	officer told you is inconsistent with what the
21	officer said in the report; isn't that true?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Well, he said that the lotion was

Α

1	in the corner of the restroom. He told me
2	that Mr. Titus had the lotion.
3	Q Okay. But if it's in the corner
4	of the restroom then doesn't it stand to
5	reason that it wasn't in the possession of Mr.
6	Titus?
7	A Well, not necessarily. I mean, he
8	could have tossed it there when he saw the
9	police coming or anything. I mean, I don't
10	Q But that's just speculation, isn't
11	it?
12	A That's speculation, yes.
13	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor,
14	what are we going to do about lunch?
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're going to eat
16	lunch.
17	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's a
18	Little after noon. I'm wondering what time
L9	we're
20	MR. LYON: I am getting close to
21	being done, if I could have your indulgence
22	for a few more minutes.

1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay. I'm
2	going to have a little bit with this witness.
3	MR. LYON: I understand that.
4	BY MR. LYON:
5	Q Let's talk a little bit about the
.6	RRASOR. This is Karl Hansen's actuarial
7	procedure for predicting sex offender
8	recidivism, correct?
9	A Yes, one of them.
10	Q And it considers only four
11	factors, right?
12	A Where was that in the
13	Q I'll be happy, if it will help
14	you, I'll give you the
15	A Yes.
16	Q I'll give you the document I
17	showed you before, which is the assessment you
18	did on 2/26/08, or at least it stated that.
19	A Yes.
20	Q The RRASOR considers only four
21	factors, right?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q It considers number of prior sex
2	offenses?
3	A Right.
4	Q It considers the offender's age at
5	the time of release?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Okay. Not the time of evaluation?
8	A That's right.
9	Q Okay. And it considers a gender
10	of the offender's previous victim?
11	A That's correct.
12	Q That is, being a female victim
13	doesn't rate but being a male victim rates, I
14	guess, as a point.
15	A Well, yes.
16	Q All right. And it considers
17	whether the offender had a familial
18	relationship with his previous victims?
19	A That's correct.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: What page are you
21	on? I'm sorry. You're on a page of his
22	testimony?

1	MR. LYON: No. We're on his
2	assessment of Mr. Titus, which is not in
3	evidence.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, go ahead.
5	I'm sorry.
6	MR. LYON: It's a document that
7	was provided to me pursuant to the subpoena
8	that we issued.
9	BY MR. LYON:
10	Q Now, Mr. Hansen has admitted that
11	the RRASOR was not intended to provide a
12	comprehensive assessment of all the factors
13	relevant to the prediction of sexual offender
14	recidivism?
15	A I don't think there's any risk
16	assessment that is designed to do that.
17	Q Instead, the intent of the RRASOR,
18	is it not, is to be used to screen offenders
19	into relative risk levels?
20	A Yes.
21	Q It's a screening tool?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q And then the risk levels could
2	then be adjusted by consideration of other
3	relevant factors?
4	A That's correct.
5	Q All right.
6	MR. LYON: If I could have a
7	minute, your Honor, I think I can exclude some
8	of what I had prepared earlier.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you need to go
10	off the record, or do you want to
11	MR. LYON: I think I can do it in
12	about 20 seconds.
13	BY MR. LYON:
14	Q One of the factors that Hansen
15	suggests should be considered is treatment
16	compliance; is that correct?
17	A In the RRASOR?
18	Q Yes.
19	A No.
20	Q Let me rephrase that. Hansen has
21	suggested, has he not, that the RRASOR should
22	te used as a screening tool and then the

1	evaluation should consider other relevant
2	factors?
3	A The RRASOR is just one of many
4	screening tools for sex offender recidivism.
5	Q And Hansen has suggested that
6	other factors should also be considered,
7	correct?
8	A Yes, he has.
9	Q One of which is treatment
10	compliance?
11	A He has said that in the past.
12	There's some question as to its relevance now.
13	Q And that is, in fact, my question.
14	In Hansen's 1998 meta analysis, the only
15	factor related to recidivism was whether the
16	offender completed the course of treatment,
17	correct, in respect to treatment compliance?
18	A I haven't read his meta analysis,
19	so I can't answer that.
20	Q Okay. It's true, is it not, that
21	the RRASOR lacks a manual? Divorced from the
22	WASOST, the RRASOR itself doesn't have a

1	manual?
2	A You know, I'm not sure if it does
3	or not.
4	Q Okay. Well, we'll move on. I
5	think you testified earlier that the
6	Washington State Institute for Public Policy
7	has done various studies relating to sex
8	offenders?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. And in 2004, the Washington
11	legislature directed the WSIPP to conduct a
12	comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of
13	the state sex offender policies?
14	A The state sex offender policies or
15	the Sex Offender Treatment Program?
16	Q I'll accept treatment program.
17	A Yes.
18	Q Okay. And as part of that
19	comprehensive analysis, WSIPP studied the End
20	of Sentence Review Committee's sex offender
21	notification procedures?

Α

Yes.

1	Q Okay. And you were aware of the
2	results of that study?
3	A .Well, there was a couple of
4	studies done.
5	Q I stand corrected. I'm aware of
6	two studies.
7	A Right.
8	Q Would that be correct?
9	A Yes.
10	Q In a January 2006 report, WSIPP
11	made the following key finding that the
12	notification consideration score has little or
13	not accuracy in predicting sex offender
14	recidivism; is that correct?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And in that same report, WSIPP
17	made the additional key finding that the risk
18	assessment score has little or no accuracy in
19	predicting sex offender recidivism, although
20	some elements had moderate predictive
21	accuracy?

That's what they said, yes.

Α